

## REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in this application. Claim 20 is amended. Claims 21-23 are new. No new matter has been added.

In view of the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw all outstanding grounds of rejection. Applicants respectfully request allowance of the application.

Applicants amend claim 20 to correct a typographical error. In accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, claim 20 now recites, among other features, "sending the updated transaction to the client." No surrender of claims scope was intended by this amendment.

The Office Action rejects under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) claims 1-6, 8-9 and 11-20 as being anticipated by Byford, U.S. Patent No. 6,220,509 (hereinafter *Byford*). The Office Action rejects under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) claim 7 as being unpatentable over *Byford* in view of W3C's "Extensible Markup Language (XML) 1.0," (hereinafter, *XML*). The Office Action rejects under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) claim 10 as being unpatentable over *Byford* in view of Tabb et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,603,025 (hereinafter *Tabb*).

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 Fed. Cir. 1987).

With respect to the present claims, the applied references, applied separately or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

*Byford* does not disclose or suggest an active document encapsulating transactions, comprising:

a first set of data fields, wherein the data fields represent attributes of a parent transaction...linking data generated by the secondary transaction to link the secondary transaction to the active document, wherein the linking data generated by the secondary transaction is used to change contents of the active document if corresponding contents of the second transaction have been changed,

as recited, among other features, in independent claim 1 (emphasis added).

*Byford* is directed to a parcel trace system for tracing parcels handled by a service provider for a plurality of clients. The system includes a relay which is responsive to a change in state of a parcel location attribute to relay the change in state of the parcel location attribute to a client database controller across the Internet. The client database controller

responds to receipt of the change in state of parcel location to write the change of state to the client database. The client database controller is further responsive to parcel location requests from the client across the second network to return a location and a parcel identifier for any parcels requested by the client. See, e.g., Abstract.

Thus, *Byford* tracks the location of a client's package transported by a parcel delivery service. *Byford* discloses updating parcel location attributes associated with the current location of a package using a database controller and returning the location and a parcel identifier for any parcel requested by the client. Assuming that the delivery of a package is a transaction, *Byford* is directed tracking a single transaction (i.e., delivery of a package) and providing the updated information to a client. Although *Byford* can track multiple deliveries, those transactions are separate transactions and are unrelated.

However, *Byford* does not disclose or suggest an active document which includes attributes of a parent transaction and linking data generated by the secondary transaction to link the secondary transaction to the active document and change contents of the active document if corresponding contents of the second transaction have been changed, as claimed.

Applicants submit, independent claim 1 is in condition for allowance over the applied art for at least the above indicated reasons.

As described above, *Byford* does not disclose or suggest:

creating a parent transaction resource, wherein the parent transaction resource represents a parent transaction and is linked to data generated by a secondary transaction and wherein the data generated by the secondary transaction is used to change contents of the active document if corresponding contents of the secondary transaction are updated,

as recited, among other features, in independent claim 11. As described above, *Byford* is directed to a parcel trace system for tracing parcels handled by a service provider for a plurality of clients. *Byford* does not disclose or suggest at least creating a parent transaction resource, wherein the parent transaction resource represents a parent transaction and is linked to data generated by a secondary transaction, as claimed. Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 11 is in condition for allowance over the applied art for at least these reasons.

With respect independent claim 18, Applicants respectfully submit that *Byford* does not disclose or suggest "updating the parent transaction resource with the transaction specific data from the secondary transaction resource, wherein any changes to the transaction specific

data are made to the data fields in the parent transaction resource,” as recited, among other features, in independent claim 18. As described above, *Byford* fails to disclose or suggest these features of the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 18 is in condition for allowance over the applied art for at least these reasons.

Neither *XML* nor *Tabb* overcome the deficiencies of *Byford* described above. For example, neither *XML* nor *Tabb* disclose or suggest an active document which includes attributes of a parent transaction and linking data generated by the secondary transaction to link the secondary transaction to the active document and change contents of the active document if corresponding contents of the second transaction have been changed, as claimed.

Applicants submit that claims 1, 11 and 18 are in condition for allowance over the applied art.

With respect to the new dependent claims, the applied references, separately or in combination, do not disclose or suggest “multiple related transactions are tracked using the active document,” as recited in new dependent claim 21. The applied references also do not disclose or suggest “wherein the parent transaction is related to the secondary transaction, the method further comprising: tracking multiple related transactions using the active document,” as recited in new dependent claims 22 and 23. Support for these features can be found in the specification at page 12 beginning on line 19. Applicants submit that dependent claims 21-23 are in condition for allowance for these additional reasons.

Claims 2-10 and 21 depend from independent claim 1, claims 12-17 and 22 depend from independent claim 11, and claims 19-20 and 23 depends from independent claim 18. Therefore, claims 2-10, 12-17 and 19-23 are allowable for at least the reasons stated above and for the additional features recited therein.

### **CONCLUSION**


In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants believe that all of the objections and rejections against this application have been fully addressed and that the application is now in condition for allowance. Therefore, withdrawal of the outstanding objections and rejections and a notice of allowance for the application are respectfully requested.

It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including

fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's deposit account no. 08-2025.

If the Examiner believes that a personal or telephonic interview would be of value in expediting the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned counsel to arrange for such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: **March 2, 2005**

---

Aldo Noto  
Reg. No. 35,628  
**ANDREWS KURTH LLP**  
1701 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Telephone: (202) 662-2700  
Fax: (202) 662-2739